FINAL REPORT

1942 GRAND JURY

Submitted to

Hon. Edmund P. Mogan
Presiding Judge

Superior Court

City and County of San Francisco

Friday, December 18, 1942

Jury Impaneled

December 19, 1941

Lloyd E. Wilson, Foreman
Max L. Rosenfeld, Secretary

December 18, 1942

Honorable Edmund P. Hogan,
Presiding Judge, Superior Courts;
City and County of San Francisco,
San Francisco, California.

The annual report of the 1942 Grand Jury of the City and County of San Francisco is presented herewith.

Before presenting the report proper, may we express the pleasure which we have had in serving under you as the Presiding Judge. You have evidenced a sincere desire to be of assistance at all times and yet at no point have you attempted in any way to dictate what course the Jury should pursue or what action it should take. We have been given freedom to work very much as we saw fit and such requests as we have made have been very graciously acceded to by you. We wish for you many continued useful and happy years on the bench.

The report is presented under four main headings, (1) Our conception of the task and our approach to it; (2) Statistical information; (3) Some major problems dealt with; (4) Recommendations.

1. Approach to the Task

We approached the work of the Grand Jury from the viewpoint that it was intended to be a body for investigation and for action on specific matters of which it became aware from any source. We did not look upon ourselves as either a detective or a police force.

There are, generally speaking, two phases to the work of a Grand Jury. The first of these is on the criminal side and the second is on what might be called the civil side. Matters on the criminal side are presented to the Grand Jury by the District Attorney's office after investigations are made by the duly constituted law enforcement bodies. The Grand Jury then proceeds to act in the light of evidence and testimony presented. It is very clear that it acts in this department only on complaints, which come either from law enforcement bodies, from individual citizens or from the Grand Jury itself as the initiating body.

We feel that the same method should be followed on the civil side of a Grand Jury's work. If a Grand Jury is to make a thorough, consciencious and painstaking investigation of every department and division of the City and County of San Francisco simply as a routine matter, it should be staffed with a competent well paid impartial body of investigators solely responsible to it. This would entail an expenditure of time and money which in our judgment would be unjustified. In this connection, we report that we have not followed those parts of Section 928 P-C which impose certain duties upon Grand Juries first impaneled in an

even numbered year. Our reason for this is that we found all of these items provided for in the present charter and upon investigation, we found that the procedures recommended were being carried out all with the proper safeguards. To have followed the sections referred to would have, in our judgment, represented a duplication and the needless expenditure of large sums of money.

We do feel that the Grand Jury should make a study sufficient to familiarize itself with the general operations of all departments and this was done by committees assigned to the departments. At the invitation of the Grand Jury and solely for the purpose of giving general information relative to the conduct of their departments, each of the following City officials, separately, gave an entire evening for the benefit of the Jury and much information was received thereby. Included were Thomas A. Brooks, Chief Administrative Officer; E. J. Cahill, Manager of Utilities; A. W. Wilder, Director of Public Works; Harold Boyd, Comptroller; and Joseph P. Course, Superintendent of Schools. The appreciation of the Grand Jury is expressed to these gentlemen for the fine contribution which they made.

This, then, has been our approach to the work of the Grand Jury and we have handled to our own satisfaction every matter presented to us either by the District Attorney's office, by individual citizens, groups of citizens, or matters revealed by other investigations made by the Grand Jury itself. We are not presumed to please everybody and we have not always reached the conclusions which others would have desired, but we are satisfied in our own minds that the ends of justice have been served to the best of our ability.

2. Statistical information

We have held 64 regular and special meetings (in addition to innumerable committee meetings) during the year at which there has been an average attendance of 79%. Attendance has been materially decreased because one of our Grand Jurors entered the service early in the year, another went into confidential work of the United States Government in a civilian capacity, and a third member has found attendance generally impossible due to the pressure of his own affairs. The remaining sixteen members have been faithful both in attendance at the meetings and in attention to their duties and have demonstrated a genuine and sincere interest in the affairs of Grand Jury. We have heard 36 cases, returning 26 indictments and in 10 cases no indictment was returned. We have had occasion to reprimand one attorney at law and have referred his case for proper handling to the State Bar Association. We have operated on an economical basis. The total amount of fees paid to all the Grand Jurors collectively for attendance at regular and special meetings during the year was $1,838.00. We are informed that this is the least expense of this type which any Grand Jury has incurred in the period since the present charter was adopted.

3. Major problems dealt with.

No serious major problem in any department of the City and County presented itself during the year. There has been one important matter in relation to the Police Department which will be reported separately. Generally speaking, the departments of the City and County of San Francisco are operated efficiently and with respect to the interests of the citizens. Our study of various departments indicates that the records and the accounts are in excellent shape and we found that the audits required under the charter had been regularly made in accordance with its provisions. It is not our intention to indulge in the usual platitudes or to give unwarranted praise and neither is it our intention to withhold any criticism which any individual Juror might wish to make as the result of investigations made by himself.

A criticism of the Traffic Fines Bureau Supervisor and one police officer in that Bureau will be dealt with in the special report on the Police Department problem referred to above.

One Juror feels that there are a number of superfluous employees in various departments of the City and he specifically refers to the Department of Public Works in which he says and, we quote from his report, "We find two men on each street sweeping machine; three men on each truck that picks up the refuse and cans at points throughout the City. One man could be eliminated from each of these machines and would be a step in the right direction. In addition to this, we should eliminate as much as possible the outmoded and costly method of sweeping streets by hand. This is an inefficient method and beyond doubt a few street cleaning machines could do the work of a dozen old men that we now find leaning on brooms throughout the City." The Department, when interviewed, agreed that improvements could be made and were frank in their statement that the problem of dismissing old men presented certain serious aspects and they agreed that as time went on they would work toward the suggestions made.

There are unquestionably points at which efficiency could be improved and expenses cut in relation to Municipal employees and we feel that progress is being made in that direction chiefly through the action of the Civil Service Commission, and we would like to say here that in our dealings with that Commission and with its secretary, A. E. Henderson, we are impressed with their sincerity and with his ability in dealing with these matters. We have the feeling that some City departments would help themselves by extending a little more generous cooperation toward this Commission, and the City as a whole would gain through greater efficiency and economy".

Police Department

We have referred to a special problem in the Police Department and we now report on it. It is a problem which, when we entered upon it, was described to us as "an old chestnut in San Francisco". It is the situation in which competent and qualified police officers who have been certified for police duty are doing

clerical duty. At the time the investigation was made, we found that in round figures ninety police officers were doing clerical duty. Of these, approximately half were disabled, convalescing, or were doing confidential police work in important positions. The remaining half were simply doing clerical work because it was easier to put a policeman into a clerk's job than to get a clerk or because the passing of new ordinances placing new responsibilities upon the Police Department made no provision whatever for the handling of the clerical work involved. Under such circumstances, the Police Department must either simply let the clerical work go and the internal wheels of the Department stop or they must assume the job themselves and be it said to the credit of the Department that they have tried their best to keep that Department functioning as the people of San Francisco demand it function.

When we attacked this problem, we found all of the customary attitudes which have made it an "old chestnut in San Francisco". There was the attitude, for example, of "Don't disturb this situation", "Let sleeping dogs lie", "The budget is already made up and nothing can be done about new employments", "How is this going to effect the personnel of the department", "Who is going to pay for new clerks", and a dozen other similar attitudes. We also found some men entrenched in soft jobs who did not want to be moved and we found at the beginning some unwillingness on the part of City officials to do very much about it. We also found the usual underground feeling that "This Grand Jury will be out of office before anything can really be done, so let's not worry too much about it". On the other hand, we found Chief of Police Charles Dullea ready and anxious to do something about it if he could be sure that his total uniformed personnel were kept intact. We found Mayor Rossi cooperative and willing to attempt to reach a workable solution. We found the Civil Service Commission anxious to work the problem out and when the Police Commission found that our committee was sincerely interested in the welfare of the Department, they were willing to sit down in conference to discuss it. We, therefore, agreed after numerous conferences to begin by changing the persons in ten positions from policemen to clerks and this has been accomplished by the cooperation of all concerned and by the passing of the necessary action by the Board of Supervisors. This is only a start and it must be kept going until the total transfer is made.

The first step was made in the Traffic Fines Bureau, and it is at this point that we want to present a criticism as frankly as we have presented praise. The only persons in the entire investigation and in the many conferences who were definitely antagonistic and thoroughly uncooperative were the supervisor of the Traffic Fines Bureau, Mr. Joseph Fogerty, and Police Officer Leo Hayes. At no point were they willing to attempt to work out a solution in a friendly manner and what was accomplished was done only against their wishes and after some very unpleasant sessions.

In this entire Police Department matter, we are impressed with the fact that there seems to be no actual basis upon which the proper Police Department personnel is based. There seems to be no agreement as to the number of men who should be in the department

and there is a decided disagreement as to the way the total personnel should be figured under the charter. This question of the correct number of uniformed policemen exclusive of department officers should be settled once and for all. Only in this way can the Police Chief be assured of having available for actual police duty the number of uniformed patrolmen required in this City. The number of clerks employed in the department should be exclusive of that number and departments of the City against which their salaries are charged should be determined. It goes without saying that a city of this size requires an adequate police force devoting its entire time to police matters, and certainly the writing of letters, the filing of correspondence, and the usual clerical routine is not the work of a man who has passed the stringent physical examination and received the specialized training required of a policeman. We point out in passing also that policemen are paid at the present time $200.00 a month and the maximum paid for clerks is $170.00 a month.

Log Cabin Ranch School

A complaint was filed with the Foreman of the Grand Jury in October concerning the Log Cabin Ranch School in San Mateo County. A special committee appointed by the Foreman made, with him, a local investigation of the background and philosophy of this school. They spent several profitable sessions with the Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, the Judge of the Juvenile Court, and other interested officials. The committee and the Foreman then made an unannounced visit to the ranch and spent the best part of a day going all through it. While it is true that there may be much to be desired from a physical standpoint in the ranch set up at the present time, we unqualifiedly endorse what has been done and commend those who have had it in charge. In making this statement, we have in mind the necessity of moving from Memorial Park to the present site and the difficulties incident to that move. We commend the philosophy of having the boys in the ranch do much of the work rather than to take in a corps of skilled men workers to complete the job in the shortest possible time.

We investigated and secured the facts on each of the three complaints which had been filed with us (by an anonymous complainer) and found in every case that the facts did not support the complaint.

We are thoroughly in accord with what is being done and recognize the ability of those who are directing the general enterprise and we think that the officials of the City and County of San Francisco would do well to offer more generous cooperation in this matter.

Public Utilities

During the year we made some study of mass transportation in San Francisco and presented a report relative to the proposed unification plan of street railways. A copy of that report is appended hereto. We have nothing further to say on this subject

because all that we could say about the miserable situation which prevails in San Francisco relative to mass transportation is known to every citizen who attempts to use the transportation facilities available. We join with all other citizens who say that the situation is a disgrace, that it is a blot upon San Francisco, and that it stands as one of the monuments to the lack of aggressive leadership in this City. Surely there is no problem which is so great that it cannot be solved if it is attacked aggressively, unselfishly and nonpolitically by a group of able men whose sole purpose is to accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Our failure to solve the problem of moving large masses of people in San Francisco is an evidence that the problem has not been attacked in the manner indicated by the kind of men described.

In the general field of traffic, we do not set ourselves up as experts, but it certainly does not take an expert to know that some of the keys to straightening out this traffic snarl are the elimination of parking downtown; the establishing of one-way streets; the elimination of middle of block stops by street cars; the establishing of specified curb stop areas for buses; the coordination of traffic signals in relation to a total plan, and the strict enforcement of the law with heavier fines for violators. If this last is to be achieved, there must be cooperation on the part of the public, the police and the courts.

District Attorney

The District Attorney is in reality the principal law enforcement officer. His powers and duties in this field are well known and the charter makes provision both for the staff and the funds with which to carry them out.

The District Attorney is also by the nature of his office a prosecutor. In his capacity as a District Attorney, that officer may aggressively and vigorously discharge his duties in respect to any and all suspected law violators and, having brought them to court, prosecute them with aggressiveness, vigor, and speed, or he may simply sit back and wait until matters are brought to his attention and then, when they are presented in court, consent to a series of continuances, prosecute in a routine fashion, and perhaps, in the end, compromise on a light sentence or even a dismissal. It is our considered opinion that the District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco should be placed in the latter general category.

A recent figure gives San Francisco's population as 723,913. It is a war time population. The problems of crime and vice attendant upon this increase in population are apparant to everyone who takes the time to observe what is going on. We feel that if it were not time before, it is time now that the District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco adopt a policy of aggressive and vigorous action involving both the initiation of investigations and the prompt prosecution of all violators with, of course, due respect to the rights of all parties involved.

We now refer to a common practice known to exist of wearing out the parties to an action before the courts by a series of continuances and postponements until finally, discouraged and disheartened, they are willing to consent to any sort of settlement in order to get the matter over with. The practice is so general that there is no point in referring to specific cases. There are two decided evils which result aside from the ultimate miscarriage of justice which may occur. They are, first, the discouraging effect upon police officers who feel that they are not given sufficient support by the District Attorney's office and the courts in promptly dispatching matters brought before them. Arrests which, because of delays and inadequate prosecutions, do not result in convictions and reasonable penalties imposed certainly do not help the morale of the department. The second result referred to is that when matters keep appearing and re-appearing on court calendars, it has the effect of crowding the calendars when they would be cleared if matters were disposed of promptly. It is recognized that there is some reason for continuances or provision would not be made for them in the law but the misuse of them was certainly never intended in the law and it is that misuse to which we refer. This can be corrected at any time by the District Attorney's office and the courts insisting upon matters being heard when the limit of reason in continuances has been reached.

Juvenile Delinquency

As the result of cases presented to the Grand Jury by the District Attorney's office, the general problem of juvenile delinquency has been considered by this body.

The statistics of delinquency at the moment are not of themselves important because they change over night. The general fact that delinquency is on the increase is of importance. Unless the underlying causes are removed, the statistics will in the long-run remain unchanged. The underlying causes concern the home, parents and the social order. Much could be said concerning the home and parents for they are, of course, the chief factors in juvenile delinquency, but our function at this time is in relation to the social order.

The chief contributors to juvenile delinquency in San Francisco are certain saloons, taverns, and hotels. To those should be added some restaurants and corner grocery stores. We hasten to say that we do not brand all saloons, taverns, hotels, restaurants and corner grocery stores as being contributors to delinquency. Evidence presented before the Grand Jury showed beyond question of doubt in our mind that the fourteen saloons, hotels and restaurants cited by us were guilty of selling to minors, including young girls, and selling after hours. In the case of certain hotels, they were harboring young girls who were not registered in their establishments. As we have said, we do not think that all saloons, hotels and restaurants are guilty but neither do we think that the fourteen cited are the only ones who are guilty.

It is well known that drinking and promiscuity is prevalent in San Francisco among minors. Some liquor is bought at corner grocery stores by the bottle, but more of it is purchased by the drink over the bar. Certain it is that these minors do not make their own liquor. The control of places which sell liquor by the drink or by the bottle in a store, saloon, tavern, hotel or restaurant is the responsibility of the District Attorney, the Police Department and the State Board of Equalization. None of these can hide behind any division of responsibility which may exist. The responsibility for the operation of these places and the enforcement of the law is their's and their's alone. The public is not interested in why they cannot enforce the law. The public is only interested in having the law enforced and is becoming more and more impatient with the excuses offered which include "too many places to supervise", "too few police officers", "too few investigators", and a dozen similar excuses. The public has been demanding and will continue to demand that absolute responsibility in these matters be placed and accepted. When the State Board of Equalization says that there are too many places in San Francisco to supervise, the public is inclined to agree with it and wonders why new licenses are issued, why old licenses are transferred and why more and more of these places aren't closed. If the Police Department hasn't sufficient officers to police such places as are licensed, the public wants to know why responsible officials of San Francisco do not see that the police force is made adequate to meet this problem.

The citizens of San Francisco are not criticising the enforcement bodies merely for the sake of criticising. They are too busy doing other things. They are becoming more and more critical because the problem is becoming more and more acute and there is little evidence of it being aggressively and vigorously dealt with by the constituted authorities. It should be borne in mind that the State Board of Equalization holds the greatest power in this entire matter because it holds the power of suspension or revocation of licenses and the exercise of that power without fear or favor and solely in the interest of the public would be the greatest weapon that could be used against an industry which has always been difficult to control.

We commend the State Board of Equalization for the part it had in establishing the new midnight closing hour for the sale of liquors and we feel that if this hour is enforced, it will be a step in the right direction in correcting conditions which now exist in and about the liquor business.

We make the observation for what it may be worth that unless the wholesale and retail liquor dealers themselves bring pressure to bear upon the State Board of Equalization, the District Attorney and local police officers to clean up this very bad situation, the public will again make an effort to clean it up by some form of local option or general prohibition. There is rapidly being added to the already growing dry elements that decent body of citizens who, while they may enjoy taking liquor themselves, do not want to see a community debauched by badly conducted liquor outlets.

We refer now to the fourteen cases mentioned in our previous formal report. We requested reports from the Police Department and from the Board of Equalization concerning them. From the Police Department, we received a very systematic and orderly report of every one of the places mentioned together with the action taken concerning them. While it may not have represented all that extreme groups might have wanted in the way of direct action, it certainly showed that the department was both aware of the situation and concerned about it. On the other hand, the reports submitted by the representative of the State Board of Equalization consisted of nine pages in which the places referred to were scarcely mentioned at all, but in which he set forth all the reasons why the Board could do very little, while at the same time claiming to have done a great deal.

The Grand Jury notified the State Board of Equalization that it intended to have an observer present when the cases were heard and we did have an observer present. We then informed the Board that we would like to be present when the cases were finally decided and we were notified that they would be decided at the Board meeting in Sacramento December 3rd. We notified the Board that we intended to send a committee to Sacramento at our own expense to be present when the decisions were made. We were then notified by the Board that there were still two cases to be heard and that the decisions would not be reached December 3rd. We have had no further notifications from the Board (as of this date, December 18), although the press reports that the last two cases were heard before the referee. We have not been notified of the date when the final decisions are to be made and we rather suspect that we won't be, because it is a well known fact that this Grand Jury is about to go out of office.

We expect the State Board of Equalization to ask why we have not indicted the hotels and the bar tenders in this matter. They know the answer just as well as we do, and the answer is the advice of the District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco to this Grand Jury to the effect that we cannot indict a hotel as such and it would be just as impossible to convict the owner, the management, the assistant management, or others as it would be to convict a "John Doe" bar tender with all the attendant problems of identification and proof. The general problem which exists need not wait for correction upon the indictment by a Grand Jury of any individual bar tender and the State Board of Equalization knows this just as well as we do.

4. Recommendations

1. We recommend that when a new Grand Jury is impaneled the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, the District Attorney, and the City Attorney meet with it in an extended session for the purpose of explaining the functions of a Grand Jury and acquainting it with their duties and their powers as well as their rights and privileges.

2. We recommend that the proper officials of the City and County of San Francisco follow through on the matter of having clerks do clerical work in the Police Department and we specifically direct the attention of the Civil Service Commission and the Police Commission to this matter.

3. We recommend that a determination be made as to what should be the proper numerical personnel of the Police Department and exactly how it should be devided relative to officers of the department and patrolmen. We further recommend that provision be made to meet this numerical requirement if it has not been reached and that it be reduced to that numerical requirement if it is now over strength. We specifically call this to the attention of His Honor the Mayor, the Civil Service Commission, the Police Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

4. We recommend that the present Traffic Advisory Board provided in the charter be eliminated and that in its stead a traffic board be established consisting of the Mayor, who will serve as chairman, the Chief Administrative Officer, the Chief of Police, the Manager of Utilities, and a representative of the City Planning Commission. This traffic board should be given full power to act in all matters effecting traffic and the necessary ordinance or charter amendment should give it a wide field of operations.

5. We recommend in the present emergency that the plan of unification of street railways submitted to the people last November 3rd be resubmitted at the earliest possible date with such changes as may seem proper and expedient.

6. We recommend that both actual and moral cooperation and sufficient funds be given the Juvenile Probation Department to operate the Log Cabin Ranch School for boys in order that this plan may be carried forward soundly and its work with these boys be not hindered in any phase.

7. We recommend that the problem of juvenile delinquency be vigorously attacked and we specifically ask His Honor the Mayor to require the District Attorney and the Police Commission to devote their attention to this problem and to present plans for coping with it. We further request His Honor the Mayor to direct the attention of the Attorney General to the problem in this County if the officials referred to fail to improve the situation by aggressive action. We further ask His Honor the Mayor to secure a full report concerning the activities of the Board of Equalization in this City and County. We specifically have in mind such matters as the number of licenses issued, the number of transfers made, the number of revocations of licenses and the general overall activities of that Board in the discharge of its responsibility to this City and County.

8. We recommend that some provision be made by law for t the filling of vacancies on the Grand Jury which occur after it is impaneled. It should not be necessary for a Grand Jury to go along for the major part of its term with less than the number provided for under the law.

9. We recommend that the County Recorder renew his attempts to have the State law amended so that the method of reproducing legal documents by photographic methods may be used in the office of the County Recorder.

10. We recommend that some provision be made legally for the continuance of at least 50% of the Grand Jury beyond the normal period of a year in order that there may be always a body of experience in the Grand Jury which will make continuous vigorous action by a Grand Jury possible. Under the present system, a Grand Jury is just beginning to reach its effectiveness when it is out of office and it goes without saying that any department of government which is not interested in really cooperating with the Grand Jury knows perfectly well that all they have to do is "stall along" until it is out of office and that the new jury will take a great many months before it becomes aware of what really goes on. We further recommend that criminal matters only of a major nature and where there is no other recourse be brought before the Grand Jury thus leaving more time for the Grand Jurors to devote themselves to the serious problems of their civil work.

11. In these days of increased numbers of transcients in San Francisco, we suggest that the District Attorney's office and the courts give consideration to the matter of bail. We do not presume to suggest that the highest possible bail be set in every case, but we do feel that the purpose of bail is not achieved when it is placed at too low a point. In this connection, we desire to commend the Presiding Judge, the Honorable Edmund P. Hogan for the manner in which he has handled the matter of bail throughout the year when indictments have been presented to him.

We respectfully request that the Honorable Edmund P. Hogan, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, cause copies of this report to be sent to His Honor the Mayor, the Chief of Police, the District Attorney, the State Board of Equalization, and to the head of each City department herein referred to.

The following Grand Jurors were present on the evening of December 14, 1942 when this report was unanimously adopted: Peter G. Boudoures, Louis M. Brizzolara, Harold F. Gardner, Stephen F. Gilligan, M. E. Harlan, Herbert L. Kelley, James Kernan, Sol J. Levy, William Nasser, Phil Noonan, George J. Petty, Al J. Quinn, Max L. Rosenfeld, Lloyd E. Wilson.

Grand Jurors Sullivan and Walters were unable to be present due to their service with the United States Government. Grand Juror King was absent due to illness. Grand Jurors Dulfer and Small were prevented by urgent business from being present.

The report has been submitted to Grand Jurors Dulfer, King and Small and meets with their entire approval.

Grand Juror Quinn under date of December 15, 1942 served notice to the Foreman by mail that he would present a dissenting report.

Respectfully submitted,

1942 Grand Jury
City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco, California

Peter C. Boudoures	Clarence Dulfer
Louis M. Brizzolara	Endicott J. King
Harold F. Gardner	William Passer
Stephen F. Gilligan	Phil Noonan
M. D. Marian	George J. Petty
Herbert L. Kelley	Max L. Rosenfeld
James Kernan	Ralph M. Small
Sol J. Levy	Lloyd E. Wilson, Foreman

The report has been submitted to Lieut. Commdr. Miller, Small Craft Section, Naval Operations.

[illegible]

[illegible]

FINAL REPORT

1943 GRAND JURY

Submitted to

HONORABLE ALFRED J. FRITZ
Presiding Judge

SUPERIOR COURT

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

da, December 13, 1943.
Monday, December 13, 1943.

Jury Impaneled

December 21, 1942.

Andrew T. Matthew, Foreman

A. Woodman Paynter, Secretary.

Honorable Alfred J. Fritz,
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court,
of the City and County of San Francisco.

The Grand Jury of the City and County of San Francisco for the year of 1943, presents its report, consisting of its personal observations, and opinions relative to matters investigated by Grand Jury committees, interviews with city officials and department heads, plus information assembled by the Grand Jury as a body.

Before presenting our report, may we express our sincere appreciation for courtesies extended the members of the Grand Jury by you as Presiding Judge. Your co-operation and judicial experience was of great assistance to us. Accept our kindest regards and best wishes for your continued success on the bench.

The Grand Jury does not believe it is qualified to judge how the Health Department, Police Department, or any other department of the city administration should be run. We have every reason to believe the officials operating the various departments are honest and experienced. The City Charter specifically states each official's responsibility, and so long as these duties are observed by normal, intelligent administration, the Grand Jury is in no position to offer criticism.

Many city officials have appeared before the Grand Jury during the year just closing; a few more than once. Through these interviews operating problems of the various departments have been ironed out satisfactorily. This is the better way.

It is always fitting and proper to give credit where credit is due. Several of our committees have been quite active, and have given generously of their time, experience and study to their particlar assignments. The chairman of the Juvenile Committee and the chairman of the Health Committee deserve special mention for their efforts. The new Curfew Ordinance, which becomes effective December 15, 1943, was carried through to a successful conclusion largely because of the efforts of the Juvenile Committee. This ordinance received the commendation of all of the enforcing bodies, and their full co-operation has been assured the Grand Jury. The Health Committee is strenuously working on the problem of unsanitary conditions and over crowding in "Jap Town". The Grand Jury endorses the proposal of the Judge of the Juvenile Court to abandon the present quarters of the Juvenile Detention Home at 150 Otis Street and build a new structure in a more favorable location to accomodate the increased demands made upon the Court and the Probation Officers; the structure to be modern and suitable for the purpose in mind of assisting young girls and boys to live healthy, normal lives in a neighborhood where fresh air, playgrounds and recreational facilities would pay big dividends.

It would not be remiss to mention here how much good can be accomplished in keeping juvenile delinquency to a normal percentage if the liquor enforcing agencies will take more drastic action against tavern owners and others violating the law. This responsibility lies

solely with the District Attorney, the Police Department and the State Board of Equalization. The citizens of San Francisco, through the Grand Jury, look to these agencies to fulfill their obligations.

Sufficient progress has not been made during the last year in the improvement of traffic conditions in San Francisco. There is still much that needs to be done, the study of traffic problems must be continuous. We need to make and put into execution better plans for reducing congestion, cutting down accidents and making the public streets more useful generally.

The Street Traffic Advisory Board, as set up in the Charter, is ineffective. It has not become, as intended, the central agency and clearing house for the development of progressive ideas for traffic improvements. Responsibility for traffic conditions is now divided among several public agencies. Their interests are in some cases divergent, with the result their opinions might conflict to the detriment of the city as a whole.

The City needs a central traffic planning department with adequate funds for its work and power to secure action on its plans. There can be no satisfactory progress in this field until essential co-ordination of effort is provided. This can be secured through a single department having special duties and responsibilities in the direction of traffic improvement only.

With reference to the present War Emergency, San Francisco has an opportunity to serve such as few American cities similarly situated ever had. The changing of the present world conflict to the Pacific should wake us up to the abnormal demands which will be made upon San Francisco. The moving of troops, munitions, equipment, and supplies on an unheard of scale will tax our shipping and warehousing to the limit; and more. Proper and adequate housing and transportation for many additional thousands must be given the immediate attention of the city administration. The Health Department will play a most important part in the months and years ahead. Buildings and equipment are not what they should be, even for present needs. Additions and improvements are most necessary, as well as adequate staffs, professional and manual, if we expect to be in a position to meet all demands made upon us through war and industry. Ample funds, wisely administered, to carry on this great humane work will repay San Francisco many times over.

The Police Department and the Fire Department are no less important under Peace Time or War Conditions and it is recommended every consideration be given to keeping intact all civilian groups trained for the present world conflict, such as Auxiliary Policemen, Auxiliary Firemen, Red Cross Workers, etc. to be available on call from any of these departments (Health, Police, Fire) should any emergency arise where their experience would be of great assistance.

The following recommendations and suggestions are respectfully submitted by the Grand Jury for your consideration.

The Grand Jury requests that copies of this report be forwarded to His Honor, The Mayor San Francisco, the Mayor elect of San Francisco, the Board of Supervisors, the District Attorney, the District Attorney elect, the Chief of Police, the State Board of Equalization, and heads of the various departments of city government.

R E C O M M E N D A T I O N S

1. The Grand Jury recommends that Grand Jurors hereafter be ppointed for staggered terms so that there will always be one-half f the jury experienced in the functions of the work. They would hus be more readily able to absorb the new and inexperienced jurors. emi-annual appointments of nine and ten members (consecutively) ommencing with the next jury formation would accomplish this purpose.

2. Section 169 of the Penal Code as it now stands makes it a isdemeanor for a grand juror to disclose any matters that might occur efore that body, but does not prohibit the District Attorney, Assistnt District Attorneys, Deputies or any witnesses from disclosing what ranspired. We recommend that the legislature amend this law to inlude District Attorneys, Assistant and Deputy District Attorneys or itnesses or any other person who might be in the grand jury room at he time of any hearing.

3. The Grand Jury recommends the establishment of a central raffic planning department with adequate funds for its work and power o secure action on its plans, its duties and responsibilities, to be elated only in the direction of traffic improvement.

4. Log Cabin Ranch - We commend the principle of rehabilitation f wayward boys for which this project is designed. However, we urge he construction program be speeded to the end that the housing, educaional, recreational and farming objectives will be reached as soon as ossible. We believe, also, the Probation Committee should at least gree to permit the Director of the camp to be an ex-officio member of he Probation Committee so that he may discuss problems and make recmmendations directly to that body.

5. Detention Home - We endorse the proposal of Judge Thomas oley to abandon the present site at 150 Otis Street in favor of a new tructure on l rger grounds to accomodate expanded housing and receational facilities. We believe this project is a fitting subject or the post-war planning authorities.

6. Curfew Law - We urge the Police Department and District ttorney's office to vigorously enforce the new curfew ordinance as oon as it becomes effective, December 15, 1943, and that the Detention ome authorities co-operate fully to the end that effective results ill be forthcoming in clearing children off the streets during late ours.

7. Juvenile Probation Committee - In view of the abnormal conitions contributing to the current increase in juvenile delinquency t becomes important that the Committee be composed of members who ill devote sufficient time to investigate conditions and to investiate the various departments under its jurisdiction.

8. Taverns - We find many taverns in San Francisco are lax in pholding the law respecting sales of intoxicating liquors to minors.

The proper enforcing of the California Liquor Act is the

oint responsibility of the District Attorney, the Police Department nd the State Board of Equalization, and the Board through the sincere xercise of its power of suspension and revocation of licenses without ear or favor, should be the proper step in correcting the present ituation.

9. The Grand Jury recommends consideration be given to amending he Charter to the effect all money budgeted to the Health Department e flexible to be used for the best and economical interests of San rancisco Hospitals, Laguna Honda Home, Hassler Health Home and the mergency Hospital Service as demands show. This is particularly de-irable in view of present war emergency conditions and possible post-ar demands.

10. The Grand Jury recommends any revision of procedure in re-ording the posting of bail with the Warrant and Bond office in unicipal Court cases be so designed as to permit complete co-ordina-ion with the courts, particularly in the matter of subsequent dis-osition of said bail by the courts.

11. It is recommended that the Police authorities address them-elves to the problems which are sure to arise during the post-war eriod and prepare a program of education among its members and pro-pective members which would include such problems as labor disturb-nces, racial problems and traffic control, and further every effort hould be made to procure the highest type of men for the police ervice. We further recommend eligible service men after the war be iven every opportunity and encouragement to become members of the an Francisco Police Department. The military experience which they ave gained would be invaluable to them as police officers.

12. The Grand Jury recommends the adoption by the Honorable oard of Supervisors of the proposed "Juke Box" ordinance suggested by olice Chief Dullea placing their control and regulation under the urisdiction of the Police Department. Such a law, we believe would reatly assist in juvenile delinquency enforcement.

This report was unanimously adopted by the Grand Jury at a regular session, held on Monday evening, December 7th, 1943 - J. Woodward Paynter being the only juror absent (illness).

The report was submitted later to Juror Paynter and met with his entire approval.

Respectfully submitted,

1943 GRAND JURY
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.

ANDREW T. MATTHEW, Foreman.	A. WOODMAN PAYNTER, Secretary.
EDWIN A. ELSBACH	HERBERT M. JEFFREYS
AUSTIN S. FERGUSON	FRED P. KLEIN
JOHN F. FIXA	RAYMOND McSHANE
CHARLES HADICKE	CHARLES R. PAGE
LOUIS A. HANSEN	JOHN D. SWEENEY
FRED P. HANSON	ANDREW E. THUESEN
RAYMOND HICKEY	WILLIAM J. TRANER
MARCEL L. HIRSCH	PAUL VERDIER
	CLELAND O. WHITTON